

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed 7/7/2006, Claims 1 – 15 were indicated as being allowable if certain §112 objections were overcome.

Applicant was invited to amend the specification to include language proposed in its June 6, 2006 Amendment. Applicant has herein submitted such amendment.

Rejection under 35 USC §112, first paragraph

The Examiner has indicated confusion regarding the harmonization of the claims that the graphical depiction of Applicant's method presented in Figure 6 (although at page 2, line 12 it is referred to as Fig. 9). Upon review of the various submissions, Applicant believes that the best solution is to simply refer the Examiner to its Figure 7 and the description associated therewith; it is believed that the steps of the method described therein will clearly answer the questions posed by the Examiner.

The location point identified in Figure 6 as PP(0), also known as the cross-over point, is arrived at in step 64 of the method of Figure 7. Similarly, location point PP(1+X) [in this case PP(2)] is determined at step 68 of the method of Figure 7. As shown, the DF set is relocated (60D) over and over again, with successive PP(1+X)'s being determined as shown in Figure 6.

The determination of location point PP(0) in Figure 6 is determined via steps 56A – 58B of the method of Figure 7. The cross-over point, which is the first best location point (PP(0)), then, is determined where a pair of successive LOB's cross (where each of the LOB's were based upon a new location for the DF set). Once the cross-over point is

determined, the successive estimated position points are determined as graphically depicted in Figure 6, and as textually disclosed in Figure 7 and the description associated therewith.

The undersigned believes that this explanation addresses and resolves each and all of the Examiner's concerns and questions, but would welcome the opportunity to provide further explanation and/or amendment should he deem it necessary.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the application be reconsidered, the claims be allowed, and the case passed to issue. If any impediment to the allowance of the claims remains after consideration of this request for reconsideration, and such impediment could be alleviated during a telephone interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

STEINS & ASSOCIATES



Karl M. Steins
Registration No. 40,186
2333 Camino del Rio South
Suite 120
San Diego, California 92108
Telephone: (619) 692-2004
Facsimile: (619) 692-2003